



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/693,430

10/24/2003

Anders E. Klemets

MS1-1721US

2006

22801 7590 12/16/2008
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/693,430	Applicant(s) KLEMETS ET AL.	
	Examiner Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	Art Unit 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed September 12, 2008.
2. Claims 1-82 are pending. Claims 1, 19, 33, 36, 39, 43, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60, 77, 78 and 81 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Office acknowledges receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 9, 2008. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

Response to Amendments

4. Per Applicants' request, Claims 1, 8, 17, 19, 24, 26, 33, 36, 39, 42, 43, 47-54, 57-60, 66, 75 and 78 have been amended and new claim 82 has been added.
5. The rejection of Claims 19-35, 43-47, 51-53, 57-59, 60-76, 77-78 and 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments to the claims and/or the specification to direct the subject matter of the invention recited in these claims to statutory subject matter.
6. The rejection of Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is however maintained for the additional reasons presented herein.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments in the Remarks filed with the Amendment have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicants' amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2421

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claim recites a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus; e.g., in this instance, receiving a first stream ... by a receiver), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing (Reference the May 15, 2008 memorandum issued by Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, titled “Clarification of ‘Processes’ under 35 U.S.C. 101”). The instant claims neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process.

Specification

10. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities: at page 12, paragraph [0043], the limitation “Configuration stream mapper 502” should be changed to -- Configuration stream mapper 504 -- .

11. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant’s cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which Applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2421

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-16, 18, 19-26, 29-30, 32-65, 69-70, 72-74 and 76-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,845,300 to Agraharam et al. ("Agraharam") in view of SDP: Session Description Protocol by Handley & Jacobson ("HandJac") (HandJac was cited by Applicants) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128342 by Maes et al. ("Maes").

Claim 1

Agraharam discloses at least *a method, comprising:*

receiving data of a multimedia presentation, wherein the data includes a first plurality of streams (see at least Abstract; 3:1-27; FIG. 4, step 410; and FIG. 7, step 510; it is noted that data of a multimedia can comprise a plurality of streams – e.g., video, audio, text); *and*

multicasting a second plurality of streams that includes added content such translated content to the received stream *to a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams* (see at least Abstract; 3:1-27; FIG. 4, step 450; and FIG. 7, step 540; it is noted that the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams can be the audio data to be translated).

Agraharam does not specifically disclose that the second plurality of streams:

includes a dedicated announcement stream, wherein the announcement stream includes presentation description information of the multimedia presentation.

However, in an analogous art, HandJac discloses a session description protocol that is used to convey information about media streams in multimedia sessions for the purpose of

Art Unit: 2421

providing participants of multimedia session with sufficient information to participate in the session (see at least sections 4-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enhance the content of the first multimedia session stream in Agraharam with the session description as taught by Handjac because this would provide participants of multimedia session with sufficient information to participate in the session.

The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose:

mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels.

However, in an analogous art, Maes discloses in FIG. 1 and [0046-0048], [0052-0054], [0057]; e.g., Maes' Image Map Coordinator 19 in FIG. 1 is equated with Applicants' configurable stream mapper 504 in FIG. 5; Maes' dynamic payload switching described in [0027-0034] and [0038] can also interpreted to perform the functions of mapping as described in Applicants' specification [0043]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Maes' image map coordinator and/or dynamic payload switching in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because the use of Maes teachings would help synchronize the announcement stream with the content stream and thus provide streamed broadcast or multimedia applications that offer multi-modal (or multi-channel) interaction with the content of a multimedia presentation (see Maes' Abstract).

Claim 19

Since Claim 19 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of method Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 1 also applies to Claim 19.

Art Unit: 2421

Claim 33

Since Claim 33 is computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claims 7 (1+7), the rejection of Claims 7 (1+7) also applies to Claim 33.

Claim 36

Since Claim 36 is a method claim version of Claim 33, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 36.

Claim 39

Since Claim 39 is an independent claim that recites the same limitations of Claims 1 and 3, the same rejections thereof also apply to Claim 39.

The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses:

wherein the multicasting a second plurality of streams includes selecting a first stream from the first plurality of streams (Maes; [0050], e.g., “the user can identify items in the multimedia presentation items ...” -- the claimed select a first stream”).

Claim 43

Since Claim 43 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claim 39, the same rejection thereof also applies.

The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses:

wherein the multicasting a second plurality of streams includes selecting a first stream from the first plurality of streams (Maes; [0050], e.g., “the user can identify items in the multimedia presentation items ...” -- the claimed select a first stream”).

Claim 48

Since Claim 48 is an independent claim that recites the same steps of method claim 39, the same rejection thereof also applies.

Claim 51

Since Claim 51 is *a computer-accessible medium storing computer-executable instructions* (see at least FIG. 3) *that, when executed, cause one or more processors to perform the same steps of Claim 48*, the same rejection thereof also applies.

Claim 54

Since Claim 54 is an independent claim that recites the same steps of Claim 48 and 7, the same rejections thereof also apply.

Claim 57

Since Claim 57 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of method claim 54, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 57.

Claim 60

Since Claim 60 is a system version of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 60.

The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses:

Art Unit: 2421

a physical device that multicasts the second plurality of streams over the network
(Maes; FIG. 1, device 10).

Claim 77

Since Claim 77 is a means-plus-function version of Claim 61 which depends from claim 60, the same rejections thereof also apply to Claim 77.

The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses:

means for multicasting the second plurality of streams over the network (Maes; FIG. 1, device 10).

Claim 78

Since Claim 78 is a means-plus-function version of Claim 60, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 78.

Claim 81

Since Claim 81 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claim 78, the same rejection also applies to Claim 81.

Claim 82

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses:

Art Unit: 2421

configuring a server to support an announcement channel (Maes, see at least [0027-0032]), a high quality video channel (Maes; see at least [0010], [0066], [0084-0087]), a high quality audio channel (Maes; see at least [0010], [0066], [0084-0087]), an application channel (Maes; see at least [0026]), one or more alternative language channels (Agraharam; see at least Abstract), and one or more alternative bit rate channels (Maes; [0019], [0027]).

Claims 2 and 20

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams are multicast on different channels* (Agraharam; see at least 5:36-37).

Claims 3, 21, 61 and 79

Rejections of respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams is multicast on predetermined different channels* (Agraharam; see at least 5:36-37).

Claims 4, 22, 40, 44 and 62

Rejections of respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the predetermined different channels comprise predetermined logical addresses* (HandJac; subsections 4.1, 5.1).

Claims 5, 23, 41, 45 and 63

Art Unit: 2421

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the predetermined logical addresses are predetermined internet protocol (IP) addresses with predetermined ports* (HandJac; subsection 5.1).

Claims 6, 24, 46 and 64

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the predetermined different channels comprise predetermined ports of a logical address* (Agraharam; see at least 5:1-20; 6:15-23; FIG. 6).

Claims 7, 25, 65 and 80

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises a second stream that includes a plurality of units of data of the multimedia presentation, the plurality of units each comprising a preselected number of previous subunits of data of the multimedia presentation* (see at least 5:55 6:6; 6:31-52).

Claims 8, 26, 34, 37 and 66

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein each unit of the plurality of units includes a key frame* (HandJac; subsection 5.1, e.g., when format of the media is MPEG video, the key frame is the I-frame which is the distinguishing frame from the background frame).

Art Unit: 2421

Claims 11, 29 and 69

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of multimedia data in different languages* (Agraharam; see at least 2:8-15).

Claims 12, 30 and 70

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises a stream of data to be used by an application running on a client receiving the second plurality of streams* (Agraharam; see at least 2:33-38).

Claims 14, 32 and 72

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the announcement stream includes security information* (HandJac; see at least subsection 5.3).

Claims 15 and 73

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses the *announcement stream* (HandJac; sections 4-5) and further discloses:

wherein stream is multicast on an out-of-band channel (Maes; see at least [0019], [0028], [0034]).

Claims 16 and 74

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the announcement stream is multicast on an in-band channel* (Maes; see at least [0019], [0028]).

Claims 18 and 76

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the announcement stream is multicast so that announcement stream data is included in a packet containing multimedia presentation data* (HandJac; see at least subsection 4.1).

Claim 38

The rejection of the base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the plurality of units of the second stream each includes enough data to reduce the amount of time needed by a multimedia player to begin playback of the multimedia presentation*.

However, this claimed feature is deemed inherent to multimedia streaming taught by the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes because in the art, streaming is defined as:

Data streaming, commonly used in the terms "audio streaming" or "video streaming" is when data moves from one computer to another and doesn't have to be completely downloaded for the receiving computer to do something with it.

www.greyfoxwebworks.com/webterms.html

Without allowing the multimedia player to begin playback as soon as the enough data is received by the player, real-time processing of multicast information stream taught by the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes would not be operative and make no sense.

Claim 35

Since claim 35 is a computer-accessible medium of Claim 38, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 35.

Claim 42

The rejection of the base claim is incorporated. Since Claim 42 recites *wherein the first stream is the announcement stream containing presentation description information* which is the limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 42.

Claim 47

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. Since Claim 47 recites the same limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 47.

Claims 49 and 52

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *terminating reception of the second stream; and selectively receiving a third stream on a third channel selected in response to receiving presentation description information from the first stream, wherein the third stream comprises another stream of multimedia data of the multimedia presentation being multicast* (Agraharam; see at least 5:22-43; it is noted that Agraharam's disclosure of "the enhanced stream may also be sent to the user's PC 110 at the conclusion of the information stream, if desired" is that the translated content is multicast as a second stream -- user's PC 110 can be more than one -- to one or more of the users

Art Unit: 2421

who chooses to receive the text version of the translated version which can be attached to the end of the second stream, as the third stream).

Claims 50 and 53

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *continuing to receive the second stream in response to receiving presentation description information from the first stream indicating that the second stream meets preselected criteria* (Agraharam; see at least 5:66 – 6:6; 7:40-50).

Claim 55

The rejection of base claim is incorporated. Since Claim 55 recites the same limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 55.

Claims 56 and 59

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the operations further comprise preselecting the second channel is preselected* (HandJac; subsection 5.1).

Claim 58

The rejection of base claim 57 is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the second channel is selected in response to receiving presentation description information from an announcement channel* (Agraharam; see at least 5:66 – 6:6; 7:40-50).

Art Unit: 2421

14. Claims 13, 31 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications by Schulzrinne et al. (“Schulzrinne”) (cited by Applicants).

Claims 13, 31 and 71

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the announcement stream includes error correction information*.

However, in an analogous art, Schulzrinne discloses that an RTP (which is specified in the announcement stream SDP -- see at least HandJac, subsection 5.1) header contains a sequence number that can be used for error correction because the sequence number is used by a receiver to detect packet loss and to restore packet sequence (Schulzrinne, “sequence number”, p. 14).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the RTP header’s sequence number in the announcement string of the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes in order to take advantage of the inherent error correction of the RTP protocol.

15. Claims 9-10, 27-28 and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of IP Multicast in RealSystem G2 by Thomas (cited by Applicants).

Claims 9, 27 and 67

Art Unit: 2421

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of video data having different bit rates*.

Since Agraharam discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream may contain additional video data that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes.

Claims 10 and 28

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of audio data having different bit rates*.

Since Agraharam discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream contains additional audio data (e.g., translated information in addition to original information -- 2:8-15) that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

Art Unit: 2421

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes.

Claim 67

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises streams of video data having different bit rates selected from the first plurality of streams*.

Since Agraharam discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream may contain additional video data that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes.

Claim 68

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of audio data having different bit rates selected from the first plurality of streams.*

Since Agraharam discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream contains additional audio data (e.g., translated information in addition to original information -- 2:8-15) that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes.

16. Claims 17 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128342 by Maes et al. ("Maes"), further in view of RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications by Schulzrinne et al. ("Schulzrinne") (cited by Applicants).

Claims 17 and 75

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does disclose RTP but does not specifically disclose *wherein the announcement stream is multicast to conform to a real-time transport control protocol (RTCP), the announcement stream is interspersed in-band within a stream of*

Art Unit: 2421

multimedia presentation data that are multicast to conform to a real-time transport protocol (RTP).

However, in an analogous art, Schulzrinne discloses that the one of the advantages of using RTCP – RTP Control Protocol – which is based on the periodic transmission of control packets to all participants in a session in addition to RTP -- Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications – is to provide feedback on the quality of the data distribution (see at least subsection 6.1 at page 19).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings disclosed by the Schulzrinne reference in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes for the advantage discussed above.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 9:00 – 17:30.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2400 Group receptionist: 571-272-2400.

Art Unit: 2421

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

December 12, 2008